

REMARKS

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's comments, which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding.

5

2. **35 U.S.C. §103(a)**. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jagadish *et al*, U.S. Patent No. 5,987,108 (hereinafter Jagadish) in view of Rassen *et al*, U.S. Patent No. 6,189,004 (hereinafter Rassen).

10 Applicant respectfully disagrees.

(a) Claim 1

Claim 1 appears hereinbelow for convenience:

15

1. A computer implemented system for processing and managing data generated by a plurality of customer communications received by a business through a plurality of diverse business communication channels, each communication channel comprising a computerized system including an interface for communication with individual or business entity customers and a records database for recording information concerning communications with individual or business entity customers, said system including:

20

a configuration component for instancing, in each of said records databases, specifications for data associated with each event involving a customer communication;

25

an extractor routine communicatively coupled with each of said contact records databases, said extractor routine extracts data concerning each event involving a customer communication from each of said contact records databases;

30

a transform routine communicatively coupled with said extractor routine, said transform routine receives data extracted by said extractor routine and transforms

the data extracted by said extractor routine into data formatted according to an analysis protocol independent of protocols of said records databases;

a central database communicatively coupled with said transform routine, said central database is specially modeled on star schema, said central database receives and stores data transformed by said transform routine, storing said data in a specially modeled star schema; and

an analysis server communicatively coupled with said central database, said analysis server accesses and synthesizes said data in response to inquiries concerning customer communication events and generates reports of the synthesis.

The Examiner stated that Jagadish teaches a system including 'an extractor routine communicatively coupled with each of said contact records databases, said extractor routine extracts data concerning each event involving a customer communication from each of said contact records databases' and cites col. 2, line 61-67 and col. 3, lines 1-9.

Col. 2, line 61-67 through col. 3, lines 1-9 of Jagadish says, as follows (emphasis added):

For example, a customer may subscribe to a plan in which calls made during the hours between 5:00 pm and 9:00 am receive a 10% discount; in which case it is useful to maintain a **summary field** containing the number of minutes of calls that the customer has made during the discount period.

In any case, the summary information is stored in a **Summary Database (SD)** that is located within the billing analysis system. Thus, in this embodiment, AMA records and processed AMA records are stored in the CDD, while summary information is stored in the SD. Once summary information has been stored in SD, it is available for immediate access. It should be noted that many alternative storage schemes may be employed without departing from the spirit of the invention.

For example, in one alternative scheme, AMA records are stored in the CDD,

summary information are stored in the SD, and processed AMA records are stored in both the CDD and SD.

5 It is readily apparent that hereinabove, Jagadish is only teaching a summary field that is stored in Summary Database 113. Jagadish does not teach 'an extractor routine communicatively coupled with each of said contact records databases, said extractor routine extracts data concerning each event involving a customer communication from each of said contact records databases' because each contact records database of the claimed invention is included in the computerized system of each communication
10 channel (preamble of Claim 1). This is not the case with Jagadish. Jagadish's database SD 113 is not a contact database included in the computerized system of each communication channel. Also, Jagadish does not teach the extractor routine of the claimed invention anywhere from the telephone 153 and the AMA record 155 to any database, be it CDD 156 or SD 159. Hence, Jagadish does not teach the extractor of
15 the claimed invention.

Therefore, neither Jagadish nor Rassen teach the features of the claimed invention either alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant is of the opinion that Claim 1 is in allowable condition. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the
20 rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

(b) Claim 2

As with Claim 1 hereinabove, Applicant is of the opinion that Claim 2 is in allowable
25 condition. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

3. **35 U.S.C. §102(e).** The Examiner has rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Rassen *et al*, U.S. Patent No. 6,189,004 (hereinafter Rassen).

30

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 3 appears as follows:

5 Claim 3

3. A method in a computer system including routines for extraction of source data from a communication contact system, transformation of said data into a standardized format, loading the data in standardized format into a dynamic storage medium, and accessing the data in standardized format for purposes of analysis comprising:

defining specifications for data;

imposing the specifications on one or more communication contact systems;

collecting in said communication contact systems, data complying with the specifications;

extracting from each of the communication contact system all data complying with the specifications;

transforming all extracted data to transformed data in a standardized format;

storing all transformed data in defined logical tables in a single database;

accessing the transformed data from the single database;

processing the transformed data according to inquiries by end users;

transmitting the results of the processing to end users.

Specifically, the Examiner stated that Rassen teaches a system which including 'imposing the specifications on one or more communication contact system' and cited col. 6, lines 64-67, adding that Rassen specifically teaches star schema that is used for business processes.

Col. 6, lines 64-67 appears as follows:

In particular, the consultant can use the enterprise manager interface 192 to define a star schema for the datamart 150. This star schema is organized around the business processes of the business for which the datamart is being created.

- 5 Rassen is using the enterprise manager interface to define a schema for the datamart, and the schema is a star schema. Rassen does not mention here any communication contact system of the claimed invention. Therefore, Rassen cannot be teaching 'imposing the specifications on one or more communication contact system' of the claimed invention.

10

- Also, the Examiner stated that Rassen teaches a system which including 'collecting in said communication contact systems, data complying with the specifications' and cites lines 9-22. Applicant is assuming the Examiner is referring to col. 7, because such paragraph neatly begins with line 9 and ends with line 22 and discusses semantic definitions. Applicant requests that the Examiner correct Applicant if Applicant's assumption is wrong.

15

Col. 7, lines 9-22 appears as follows:

- The connectors 162, the semantic definitions 163, and the source system information 164, are all related to the extraction of the data from the source systems 110. The connectors 162 define the access routines for extracting the source systems data 110. The semantic definitions 163 define how that extracted data should be converted when it is loaded into the datamart 150. The semantic definitions 163 provide important advantages to the system 100. In particular, the semantic definitions 163 allow for a simplified definition of the datamart 150, consistent meaning of the data in the datamart 150, and allow for complex changes to the schema to be easily propagated to the datamart 150. The source system information 164 defines how to extract the data from the systems 110.

20

25


It is readily apparent that Rassen does not teach 'collecting in said communication contact systems, data complying with the specifications' (emphasis added), as in the claimed invention. If Fig. 1 to Rassen, to which the paragraph hereinabove refers, the metadata 160 is in system 100. Hence, nowhere does Rassen teach 'collecting in said communication contact systems, data complying with the specifications'.

Therefore, because Rassen does not teach 'imposing the specifications on one or more communication contact system' and does not teach 'collecting in said communication contact systems, data complying with the specifications', Rassen does not teach all limitations of Claim 3. Therefore, Applicant is of the opinion that Claim 3 is in allowable condition. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant considers the claimed invention to be distinguished
5 from the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's
withdrawal of the rejections raised in the above referenced Office Action, such that a
Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the present application is therefore
allowed to issue as a United States patent. The Examiner is invited to call to discuss
the response. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees
10 due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 07-1445.

Respectfully Submitted,



15

Julia A. Thomas

Reg. No. 52,283

Customer No. 22862